

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 26, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed.

By this response, claim 1 is hereby amended to clarify the invention, and not for reasons of patentability. No claims are hereby canceled, and no new claims have been added. Claims 2 and 11 were canceled by a previous response. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-10, and 12 remain pending in the subject application.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims do not include new matter. Support for the amendment to independent claim 1 can be found at least on page 3, lines 9-18 and page 5, lines 26-32 of the specification.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested in view of the above amendments and the reasons set forth below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Although it is never mentioned in the Office Action, Applicants have assumed that the Examiner has withdrawn the indication that claim 12 includes allowable subject matter, since claim 12 stands rejected in the Office Action dated November 26, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleges that Applicants do not provide any support/evidence in the specification for the limitation which recites “if said system condition is not met with in a predetermined time period”, in line 5 of claim 1. However, Applicants contend that lines 9-18 on page 3, e.g., of the specification as originally filed provide support for this feature. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Beck et al. (WO 01/17834) (*Beck*, hereinafter) in view of Cramer et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 5,027,529) (*Cramer*, hereinafter). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants respectfully submit that present independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, are patently distinguishable over *Beck* and *Cramer*, since *Beck* and *Cramer*, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features recited in the pending claims. For example, independent claim 1 (emphasis added) recites:

1. A vehicle air supply system having a compressor, an air dryer, a reservoir adapted to receive air from the compressor via the air dryer, and control means operable to cause a standard regeneration of the air dryer when a predetermined system condition is met, the control means also being operable to cause an intermediate regeneration of the air dryer in advance of said predetermined system condition being met if said system condition is not met within a predetermined time period, **the control means further being operable to prevent the intermediate regeneration**, wherein the control means includes a governor adapted to cause the standard regeneration and a governor bypass adapted to cause the intermediate regeneration, the control means being adapted so as to disable the governor bypass to prevent the intermediate regeneration, wherein the control means includes a timer, **wherein the control means is operable to selectively cause and prevent the intermediate regeneration depending upon air supply requirements**.

Thus, independent claim 1 is directed to, *inter alia*, the features of the control means further being operable to prevent the intermediate regeneration, and wherein the control means is operable to selectively cause and prevent the intermediate regeneration depending upon air supply requirements.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Beck* nor *Cramer*, taken either alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the features of the control means further being operable to prevent the intermediate regeneration, and wherein the control means is operable to selectively cause and prevent the intermediate regeneration depending upon air supply requirements, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner correctly admits that *Beck* “fails to disclose a control means also [to] selectively cause and inhibit the regeneration depending upon air supply requirements as claimed” (see, e.g., page 4 of the Office Action). However, as seen on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner purports that *Cramer* discloses “a compressed air system where a control unit enabling and disabling of the [*sic*] in response to pressure level variations in the system and it also responds to compressor disabling by causing the system air dryer to regenerate or purge for a predetermined time period (please see the abstract; figs. 1-2; see also col. 1, lines 18-23, lines 35-40, col. 1, line 64 to col. 2, line 9, col. 2, lines 13-17, col. 4, lines 7-18, col. 4, line 61 to col. 5, line 9 and col. 6, lines 11-15)”.

However, *Cramer* merely discloses a conventional compressed air system which is directed to the concept of terminating a purge of the air dryer that has already commenced. Termination of the purge cycle of the air dryer in *Cramer* occurs in instances when the reservoir pressure drops to a predetermined level. *Cramer* discloses on col. 5, lns. 26-36 (emphasis added) that “[s]ince the air dryer is purged at regular intervals...high quality compressed air that is relatively moisture free even in applications in which large quantities of air are consumed is assured...the pressure level in the system is not allowed to reach a dangerously low level at any time because of the resetting of the purge timer when the pressure of the reservoir drops to a dangerously low level, thereby terminating the purging of the air dryer and permitting the compressor to come back on load.”

However, *Cramer* is completely silent with regard to preventing the commencement of the purge cycle, as in the present invention. The present invention contemplates circumstances or operating conditions of the vehicle air supply system where the commencement of such a purge of air flow could cause problems. For instance, the vehicle may be provided with an arrangement for operating pneumatic tools, with pneumatic pressure being supplied by the reservoir. Such an arrangement may comprise a conduit, e.g., a flexible hose, connected to a valve of the air supply system, which valve can be opened and closed to admit air from the reservoir to enter the conduit, and pneumatically powered tool connected to the conduit. The tool may be, for example, a pneumatic cutter or wrench. Taking the example of an emergency

response vehicle, it will be appreciated that the interruption of the operation of a pneumatic tool in a rescue situation is highly undesirable.

In such an arrangement, the control means are able to recognize that an uninterrupted supply of air is likely to be required. For example, if the vehicle is stationary with the engine running (i.e., running the compressor), and the conduit valve is opened, it can be determined that a pneumatic tool is likely to be used. The control means would be able to ascertain this from sensors monitoring the vehicle speed, ignition system and conduit valve position. Consequently, the control means acts to prevent the possibility of an intermediate regeneration occurring by the methods described in the present specification, i.e., suspending or modifying the operation of the time which normally causes the intermediate regeneration, or blocking the intermediate regeneration signal to the air dryer (see, e.g., page 5, lines 21-32 of the present specification).

For at least the reasons stated above, neither *Beck* nor *Cramer*, either taken alone or in combination, anticipate or render obvious all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of independent claim1.

Claims 3-10 and 12 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1, but also because they are distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of these claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney/agent to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY LLP

Date: February 23, 2009

/Anthony J. Canning, Reg. #62,107/

Anthony J. Canning

Registration No. 62.107

NIXON PEABODY LLP

401 9th Street, N.W.

Suite 900

Washington, D.C. 20004-2128

(202) 585-8000